SECTION: TEXT AS A FABRIC OF CULTURE

"Is Pushkin our everything"? A.S. Pushkin as a national hypertext

"Pushkin é nosso tudo"? A.S. Pushkin como hipertexto nacional

"¿Pushkin es nuestro todo"? A.S. Pushkin como hipertexto nacional

Alexey Yuryevich Ovcharenko[1]
orcid.org/000-0002-8544-5812
ovcharenko_ayu@pfur.ru

Abstract: The article deals with the interdisciplinary problem of A.S. Pushkin's creative biography (life and texts in their common genesis) as a Russian national hypertext. The article considers the possibility of using the concepts of "hypertext" by Ted Nielson, "dialogism" by M. Bakhtin, "intertextuality" by Y. Kristeva, "text without shores" by R. Barthes and J. Derrida, etc., "opera aperta" – an open work by U. Eco and "palimpsest" by J. Genette to describe the space of Pushkin's text. The stages of formation and development of Pushkin's hypertext are defined: from manuscripts as protohypertexts and published texts, from the phrases "the sun of our poetry" (V. Odoevsky) and "Pushkin is our everything" by Ap. Grigoriev, which have become memes in modern context, from the image of Pushkin in the memoirs of his contemporaries to the emergence of the Pushkin canon and its later reinterpretation in the critical articles by V. Khodasevich and others; and, furthermore, from the discussions of the first half of the 1920-s between V. Veresaev and V. Khodasevich about how to write about Pushkin and how to write biographies of the poet, from discussions about how to read Pushkin ("slow reading" by M. Gershenzon and the perception of this method in the historical and literary context of the 1920-s and 1930-s) to the formation of Russian Pushkin studies and the formation of the Pushkin cult during the Pushkin Days timed to the 100th anniversary of the poet's death in 1937, from using his works in the ideological and cultural discourse of the USSR era to rethinking them in the Russian segment of the Internet. Possible strategies of studying Pushkin's image in modern cinema, TV series and digital environment – small genres of Internet folklore – are suggested.

Keywords: A.S. Pushkin; Russian culture and literature; creative biography; intertextuality; digital environment.

Resumo: O artigo trata do problema interdisciplinar da biografia criativa de A.S. Pushkin (vida e textos em sua gênese comum) como um hipertexto nacional russo. O artigo considera a possibilidade de usar os conceitos de "hipertexto" de Ted Nielson, "dialogismo" de M. Bakhtin, "intertextualidade" de Y. Kristeva, "texto sem margens" de R. Barthes, J. Derrida e outros, *opera aperta* – "uma obra aberta" – de U. Eco e "palimpsesto" de J. Genette para descrever o espaço do texto de Pushkin. São definidas as etapas de formação e desenvolvimento do hipertexto de Pushkin: desde manuscritos como proto-hipertextos e textos publicados, das frases "o sol da nossa poesia" (V. Odoevsky) e "Pushkin é o nosso tudo" (Ap. Grigoriev), que se tornaram memes no contexto moderno, da imagem de Pushkin nas memórias de seus contemporâneos até o surgimento do cânone de Pushkin e sua posterior reinterpretação nos artigos críticos de V. Khodasevich e outros; e, além disso, das discussões da primeira metade da década de 1920 entre V. Veresaev e V. Khodasevich sobre como escrever sobre Pushkin e como escrever biografias do poeta, das discussões sobre como ler Pushkin ("leitura lenta" de M. Gershenzon e a percepção desse método no contexto histórico e literário das décadas de 1920 e 1930) até a formação dos estudos russos sobre Pushkin e a formação do culto a Pushkin durante os Dias de Pushkin, coincidindo com o 100° aniversário da morte do poeta em 1937, do uso de suas obras no discurso

[1] Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moskow, Russia.

ideológico e cultural da era da URSS até repensá-las no segmento russo da internet. São sugeridas possíveis estratégias de estudo da imagem de Pushkin no cinema moderno, séries de TV e ambiente digital – gêneros menores do folclore da internet.

Palavras-chave: A.S. Pushkin; cultura e literatura russa; biografia criativa; intertextualidade; ambiente digital.

Resumen: El artículo aborda el problema interdisciplinario de la biografía creativa de A.S. Pushkin (vida y textos en su génesis común) como un hipertexto nacional ruso. El artículo considera la posibilidad de utilizar los conceptos de "hipertexto" de Ted Nielson, "dialogismo" de M. Bakhtin, "intertextualidad" de Y. Kristeva, "texto sin orillas" de R. Barthes y J. Derrida, etc., "opera aperta" – una obra abierta de U. Eco y "palimpsesto" de J. Genette para describir el espacio del texto de Pushkin. Se definen las etapas de formación y desarrollo del hipertexto de Pushkin: desde manuscritos como proto-hipertextos y textos publicados, de las frases "el sol de nuestra poesía" (V. Odoevsky) y "Pushkin es nuestro todo" de Ap. Grigoriev, que se han convertido en memes en el contexto moderno, de la imagen de Pushkin en las memorias de sus contemporáneos hasta el surgimiento del canon de Pushkin y su posterior reinterpretación en los artículos críticos de V. Khodasevich y otros; y, además, de las discusiones de la primera mitad de la década de 1920 entre V. Veresaev y V. Khodasevich sobre cómo escribir sobre Pushkin y cómo escribir biografías del poeta, de las discusiones sobre cómo leer a Pushkin ("lectura lenta" de M. Gershenzon y la percepción de este método en el contexto histórico y literario de las décadas de 1920 y 1930) hasta la formación de los estudios rusos sobre Pushkin y la formación del culto a Pushkin durante los Días de Pushkin, coincidiendo con el 100° aniversario de la muerte del poeta en 1937, del uso de sus obras en el discurso ideológico y cultural de la era de la URSS hasta repensarlas en el segmento ruso de Internet. Se sugieren posibles estrategias de estudio de la imagen de Pushkin en el cine moderno, series de TV y entorno digital - géneros menores del folclore de Internet.

Palabras clave: A.S. Pushkin; cultura y literatura rusa; biografía creativa; intertextualidad; entorno digital.

Introduction

The topic stated in the title of our article is enormous, just as Pushkin's creative heritage itself is enormous. The work on systematization, commentary and publication of it is far from being completed, just as the publication of the complete academic collection of the poet's works, which has been underway at the Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences (the Pushkin House) for many decades, is still

unfinished[2]. We should also note the first digital collection of the poet's works and manuscripts created by the Pushkin House staff – the first step on the way to creating the digital universe of A. Pushkin. We mean two projects: 1) "Pushkin zifrovoy", "presenting all materials about Pushkin in the form of a connected system of texts and documents, including large-scale digitization of both Pushkin's texts and materials about him [...] the knowledge accumulated throughout the history of studies in one place, materials about the works, life of the poet and the context of his time"[3] and 2) "Pushkin Digital":

> [...] the project of a digital academic edition of Pushkin's works, ... not only texts provided with an extensive historical and literary commentary, but also a multimedia encyclopedia of works, containing thousands of external links, hundreds of books and articles, as well as dozens of sheets of Pushkin's manuscripts digitized and provided with a special transcription, allowing to trace the course of the poet's work...., a new way of presenting philological knowledge in the form of a multifunctional digital resource[4].

Let us draw attention to a circumstance, highly important for the topic of our article, which often escapes the attention of literary historians: Pushkin's hypertext began to take shape already in the first editions of the collections of the poet's works, poems of different periods, prose and drama, which were a kind of an open book – "opera aperta". Umberto Eco would write about it much later – each editor (as a rule, it is stated in the preface) presents his own Pushkin – his own chronology of creativity, his own internal composition of texts, his own plot of the edition, his own commentary, etc., and numerous published works of varying degrees of academism – "Pushkin and..." – give this book an additional volume. It should be remembered that one of the first publishers of the posthumous collection of the poet's works, P.V. Annenkov, used not only extracts from magazine articles of the epoch and their polemics,

---

but also oral stories of the poet's contemporaries, which allowed to show the formation of public evaluation of works by Pushkin and the image of the poet himself in the Russian historical-literary and public consciousness.

Obviously, it is possible, albeit with a certain conventionality, to speak of three already formed hypertexts: one is actually the whole of all texts by Pushkin, including manuscripts, as well as the apocryphal Diary No.1; another is the "science of Pushkin", pushkiniana or pushkinistics, a dialog between historians and theorists of literature; the third one, in the same sphere, is the artistic reinterpretation of the poet's fate and texts by him in the texts of writers and filmmakers. In the era of Web 2.0, a fourth Pushkin's hypertext began to take shape, the emergence of which is associated with the destruction of the canon of how the poet's work is perceived, the transfor-mation of Pushkin from "the sun of our poetry" into Pushkin – the character of online anecdotes, Pushkin the meme, into Pushkin – the author and the character of visual novels and numerous fanfics on Ficbook.

Description and analysis of possible Pushkin's hypertexts

The term "intertextuality"[5] proposed in 1967 by Y. Kristeva (1998), which referred to texts of different nature, has been transformed, and with the advent of the Web 2.0 era, today we speak of "hypertext" – an "open structure" – in relation to literature (although as early as 1934, in a letter to V. Khodasevich, M. Tsvetaeva wrote that "long ago I stopped dividing poems into my own and those by others, into 'you' and 'me', I do not know

authorship" (Tsvetaeva, 1995, p. 466).

The very notion of "hypertext", introduced into scientific circulation by Ted Nelson in 1965, was relevant for computer discourse at that time, but then, in 1982, Gerard Genette, the author of the concept of palimpsest (Genette, 1982), proposed the notion of "Architex" as an object of poetics (Genette, 1982, p. 7)[6]. It is nowadays used in the broadest interpretation, like Lotman's notion of "text" (Lotman, 1998) – the world is seen as a huge textual space, a certain ocean of textuality, where the writer himself, his texts, and the evaluation of these texts exist – something akin to polyphony, which M. Bakhtin (2002) wrote about in relation to the novels by F. M. Dostoevsky.

The return to the author, the ongoing polemics with the concept of his death (R. Barthes), is thus somehow connected with the apparent desire to trap someone's life into various media – the life, which the writer seems to gradually lose sight of while creating his texts (although contemporary authors of autofiction and ego-documents may disagree with this).

However, we know that Pushkin, creating his life, creating this or that poetic context of his bio-graphy, divided the life lived and the life written by him, strove to get away from its traditional linear form, narrating about the subject from birth to death, and created a concept, innovative for the early 19th century, encompassing writing as life and life as writing (R. Barthes). He believed (later this concept of life-building was taken up and developed by the Russian Symbolists, and the artists and theorists of the LEF (left front of arts) put forward the idea of art as life-building) that the realm of life and the realm of writing are inseparable from each other, that writing (creati-

---

5   M. Yampolsky points out that this notion originated from the theories by Y. Tynyanov, M. Bakhtin and the theory of anagrams by F. de Saussure: YAMPOLSKY, M. *Memory of Tiresias*. Intertextuality and Cinematography. Moscow: RIK Kultura, 1998. p. 32-40.
6   " *L'objet de la poétique, disais-je à peu près, n'est pas le texte, considéré dans sa singularité (ceci est plutôt l'affaire de la critique), mais architexte, ou si l'on préfère l'architextualité du texte (comme on dit, et c'est un peu la même chose, «la littérarité de la littérature»), c'est-à-dire l'ensemble des catégories générales, ou transcendantes — types de discours, modes d'énonciation, genres littéraires, etc. — dont relève cha-que texte singulier. Je dirais plutôt aujourd'hui, plus largement, que cet objet est la transtextualité, ou transcendance textuelle du texte, que je définissais déjà, grossièrement, par « tout ce qui le met en relation, manifeste ou secrète, avec d'autres textes. La transtextualité dépasse don cet inclut l'architextualité, et quelques autre stypes de relations transtextuelles…* " — "The subject of poetics, generally speaking, is not the text, viewed in its uniqueness (this is rather a matter of criticism), but the architext, or, if one prefers, the 'architextual textuality' (as we say, and this is somewhat the same thing, the 'literariness of literature' – italics is ours (A.O.)), that is, the total of general categories, or trans-cendent ones – types of speech, modes of utterance, literary genres, etc. – to which each individual text belongs. I would rather say today, in a broader sense, that this object is the transtextuality, or textual transcendence of a text, which I have already defined in a general way as "everything that connects it, explicitly or implicitly, to other texts". Thus, transtextuality goes beyond and includes architextuality and some other types of transtextual relations" (Genette, 1982, p. 7, our translation).

ve re-creation) of oneself can be made up from elementary particles (lived moments, scenes, images, sensations, words) extracted from one's own life, as well as from the perception of one's texts by others and from the texts of contemporary writers, especially European ones.

Russian culture and literature knew many examples of artists and writers forming their creative destiny: from "The Creation of Karamzin" to the life-building of the Symbolists[7] and the rethinking of their ideas in life-building, – theories, poetry and life strategies of "Proletkult" and Futurists (future LEF members) with their performances, style and clothing as an important element of performance and self-presentation (yellow jacket of V. Mayakovsky, painted face of "the father of Russian Futurism" D. Burliuk, etc.), turning "a fact of life" into "a fact of literature" – Mayakovsky's "Give Me a Fine Life" (1927) and "Searching for Socks" (1928). In contemporary Russian literature it is, of course, Dmitry Aleksandrovich Prigov, a character of his own texts and a cultural project named after himself.

In this scientific and personal biography and creative work, ideas and texts are interconnected and mutually definable, dialogical, becoming part of the "historical movement of culture" (Y. Lotman). And in this creative biographism, the features of protohypertext already emerge, as in Pushkin's manuscripts (the description of which, undertaken by V. Yakushkin in issues 2-12 of the journal Russkaya Starina in 1884, retains its scientific value) – as B. Tomashevsky stated, "the transcript of the creative process" with their multilayered editing, drawings as certain hyperlinks, when a word gives birth to a graphic accompaniment, and another word grows out of the graphic accompaniment, allowing us to see the genesis of the unity of the poet's creative system. It is obvious that Pushkin, being the creator of his poetic biography and the creator of his life as a text, was concerned with the question, much later formulated by R. Barthes

in his seminars at the Collège de France in 1978-1979/1979-1980, whether life and text are really homologous, and whether it is possible to fully create and understand life in writing and vice versa, whether writing will be enough to create life (Barthes, 2015). All these questions confront those who want to write a biography of Pushkin, presenting it as a universe in the historical movement of Russian culture.

Since one of the vectors of development of Pushkin's hypertext is its centripetal force, it would be logical to consider the genesis of Pushkin's universe in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries as the epoch which finally formed the synthetic image of the poet himself, the reception of his work, and when gave birth to translations of his texts into foreign languages (primarily into the languages of the peoples of the USSR).

In the twentieth century literary historians with different cultures and different aesthetic-theoretical and socio-political attitudes started getting involved into the world of Pushkin. These were, for example, Mikhail Gershenzon and Abram Lezhnev, two seemingly completely different figures. One of them being an idealist and Marxist, publisher of "Russian Propylaea" (1915-1919), the other – a regular author of "Pravda", "Print and Revolution", theorist and leading critic of the Commonwealth of Revolutionary Writers "Pereval", they both made the history of Russian literature their destiny.

It is important, in our opinion, to pay attention to the genesis of the components of the Pushkin myth in Russian culture, the milestones of which were the speech on Pushkin by F.M. Dostoevsky (1880), which crowned the celebration of Pushkin Days, the opening of the Pushkin monument in Moscow[8] and the days of the poet's memory in the year of the centenary of his death in 1937. It was during this year that his "denationalization" took place: Pushkin finally became part of the new mental Soviet space[9]: the issue of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* on February 8, 1937 was entirely devoted

---

[7] "[…] the artist must become his own form: his natural self must merge with creation: his life must become artistic. He himself is "the word that has become flesh" (Bely, 1908, p. 41).

[8] On the significance of Pushkin's days in the historical and literary process and public consciousness of Russia, see: LEVITT, Marcus C. *Literature and Politics*: Pushkin's Holiday of 1880. St. Petersburg: Academic Project, 1994. 265 c.

[9] For detail, see abstract of the dissertation: SHEMETOVA, T. G. *Biographical myth about Pushkin in Russian literature of the Soviet and*

to Pushkin – "The Glory of our Motherland", "The Bright Mind" and "Lenin's Favorite Poet".

Then, by the decree of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR on February 9, 1937, the Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow was named after the poet, Bolshaya Dmitrovka Street in Moscow was turned into Pushkin Street, and Detskoye Selo was renamed the town of Pushkin. In the same issue of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, the cult of Pushkin was linked to the recently emerged cult of V. Mayakovsky (although even Proletkult poets wrote about the "radiant" Pushkin): "The best, most talented poet of our Soviet era, by his poetic service to the Soviet people, by his struggle for the people's language in poetry, continued and developed the creative direction of Pushkin" (Glory [...], 1937).

Pushkin's hypertext experienced a second birth together with the era after the October coup of 1917. The reflection of the transitional epochs – the beginning of Pushkin's creative path and the "big twenties" (Ovcharenko A. Y.) – in the historical and literary process had similar features, which allowed Y. Tynyanov to throw a bridge between them – "Archaists and innovators" sounded topical for 1926 as well, which was the time of acute discussions about the classical heritage and learning from the classics. The emergence of new points of view began with the well-known proposal of the Futurists to "throw Pushkin off the Ship of Modernity" (1912). Afterwards this intense dialog between contemporaries, representatives and heirs of different cultures, sometimes diametrically opposed, continued both in Russia and in the Russian Abroad[10]. All this gave Pushkin's hypertext a new dynamic – from the questionnaire of the magazine "Book about Books" timed to the 125th anniversary of the poet (1924), to the fundamental two-volume "Pushkin's Life" by V. Veresaev (1926-1989), Yuri Tynyanov's "The Archaists and Pushkin" (1926) and "Pushkin" (1935-1943), to the apotheosis of the national Mayakovsky-Pushkin canon "under a bright red flag" in 1936-1937, a

canon that became part of the new Soviet mental space for a long time. Pushkinism of the Soviet period requires a separate description and analysis.

A vivid example of such a dialog, almost completely unexplored in literary science, is that of M.O. Gershenzon and A.Z. Lezhnev – united by the era and a common interest in Pushkin's work, and attention to the inner world of Pushkin's texts. In this extramural dialog of theirs, Pushkin's text occupies a central place. Paradoxically, in analyzing this very text they find a common language and express a common pathos: they speak, as V. Khodasevich did, against turning Pushkin's text into an "aesthetic barrier"; together with B. Tomashevsky (who criticized M. Gershenzon's "slow reading") – against those who see in Pushkin's text only "thoughts"; together with K. Chukovsky – against the Pushkin of "marmalade aesthetes"; together with O. Mandelstam, who advocated for poetic literacy, they call for reading Pushkin as he is written, and together with the "Pereval" critic D. Gorbov proclaim: "Pushkin is not classical, but living".

Like M. Gershenzon, A. Lezhnev (1937) argued that art is not a mere fixation of facts or illustration, but transformation, transfiguration, "tragedy" and catharsis. The ideal of a creative person for A. Lezhnev was Pushkin's Mozart as a symbol of a true artist – not a master, but a creator in deep, organic connection with the world, as a symbol of an infinitely free creative spirit. "Mozartianism" and "tragedy" became the main ideas of the philosophy of art for the Commonwealth "Pereval", and A. Lezhnev was its theorist.

In this unfinished imaginary dialog, A. Lezhnev (1937) agrees with M. Gershenzon:

> Pushkin is revealed not into the past, but into the future. He cannot be studied only 'as an ordinary figure of literature' (B. Tomashevsky). The task of criticism is not only to insert the writer into the epoch, but also to understand why he preserved life and effect beyond the limits of his epoch, at the time when almost everything that surrounded him, is covered by indifference and oblivion [...]

post-Soviet periods. (D. in Philology) – Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, 2011.
10   *Cf.* CHERNIGOVSKY, D. N. *The biography of A.S. Pushkin in the literary studies of the 1920-1930s in the USSR and Russian abroad*: genesis, evolution, methodology. Dissertation (Dr. in Philology) – MSPU, Moscow, 2009.

It was M. Gershenzon, according to A. Lezhnev (1937, p. 381-382), who "[...] understood that the literary problem cannot be resolved as a narrowly technical, as a formal one, and tried to include it into some general connection where it would receive explanation and meaning [...]".

It is important to mention here Franco Moretti's "distant reading" – attention to the corpus of texts. Pushkin's 1836 "Kamennoostrovsky Cycle" started to be understood as a narrative unity, as a lyrical cycle not immediately. Only in 1954 N.V. Izmailov wrote a separate article on it, which can be fully extrapolated to the formation of Pushkin's hypertext, which is not only in the stage of constant expansion and enrichment by various new meanings but is not yet perceived as a hypertext itself – traditionally, "our everything" is presented as a concept sphere of Russian culture.

Here it is important to say a few more words about Pushkin's hypertext and Pushkin's canon: E. Baratynsky, a poet who has only recently taken his rightful place not as "a poet of Pushkin's time", not as one of Pushkin's "entourage", but as a profound philosophical lyricist of the first half of the 19th century, although even his contemporaries understood the magnitude of E. Baratynsky's poetic gift. One cannot but recall the words of P. Vyazemsky (1984, p. 271), who knew both poets closely:

> Baratynsky both during his lifetime and at the very time of his poetic activity did not quite enjoy the sympathy and respect that he was worthy of. He was overshadowed and, so to speak, pressed by Pushkin, although they were friends, and the latter highly valued his talent. However, partly everywhere, and especially in our country, public opinion leaves such a narrow path for success that even two, not three or more, have no space to pass. We clear the way for our idol, carry him on our shoulders, and do not want to know others, if we know them, it is only to knock them down from the right and from the left and let the idol go, trampling them underfoot. Both in literature and in the civil state environment we take as a rule this exclusivity, this unconditional supreme loneliness.

In our discussion of the established Pushkin canon, it is interesting to recall E. Baratynsky's already textbook poem "My gift is poor and my voice is not loud" (1828), which is undoubtedly a part of Pushkin's small hypertext "Monument"[11] (1836). A comparative analysis of both texts is beyond the scope of this article, so we will only point out that the hope of finding a reader in future generations – "I will find a reader in posterity" by E. Baratynsky, a poet whose "gift is miserable" and whose "voice is not loud", was echoed by O. Mandelstam, a poet of a completely different era and culture.

It is interesting that the article "On the Interlocutor" from the collection "On Poetry" (1929) was originally titled "On the Moment of Communication in Poetic Creativity". O. Mandelstam (1928) writes about the dialog between poets and their texts across times (de Bakhtin):

> Every person has friends. Why shouldn't a poet address his friends, people naturally close to him? A sailor in a critical moment throws a sealed bottle with his name and a description of his fate into the waters of the ocean. Years later, wandering through the dunes, I find it in the sand, read the letter, recognize the date of the event, the last will of the deceased. I had the right to do it. I did not print out someone else's letter. The letter sealed in the bottle is addressed to whoever finds it. I found it. Then I am the mysterious addressee. Reading a poem by Baratynsky, I have the same feeling as if such a bottle has come into my hands. The ocean with all its vast element came to its rescue, – and helped it fulfill its destiny, and a sense of providential overwhelmed the finder. In the marine's throwing the bottle into the waves and in the sending out the poem by Boratynsky there are two identical distinctly expressed moments. The letter, as well as the poem, are not definitely addressed to anyone (in particular). Nevertheless, both have an addressee: the letter is for someone who happened to notice the bottle in the sand, the poem – for "a reader in posterity". I would like to know which of those who will come across Boratynsky's lines will not shudder with a joyful and terrible shiver, as one does when one is suddenly called by name (Mandelstam, 1928, p. 19-20).

It was in the era of the "big twenties" (Ovcharenko A.Y.) when a new attitude to the poet's work was formed. New, previously impossible assessments, rethinking by new literary forces came – the poets of Proletkult proclaimed the poet an ally in their struggle for poetry of active action against

---

[11]   "The Monument" by A.S. Pushkin, in turn, is part of a large poetic hypertext from M. Lomonosov and G. Derzhavin to V. Khodasevich and I. Brodsky.

the "night owls, cuckoos" of the Symbolists, literally understanding the meaning of the classic phrase "the sun of our poetry", – "He is with us, the radiant Pushkin" (Kirillov, 1924, p. 319-320).

Anna Akhmatova, who perceived Pushkin's mystery writing first of all from the angle of a poet of the Silver Age, wrote about the emergence of the Pushkin universe, that the epoch in which the poet lived and worked began to be called "Pushkin epoch" not immediately, and only gradually it acquired the textomatically known helio / Pushkin-centric form, – around "the sun of our poetry" (V. Odoevsky) orbits of "poets of the Pushkin era" and "Pushkin's contemporaries" were formed: "the whole epoch (not without a creak, of course) little by little began to be called Pushkin's", all "cavalier ladies, members of the highest court, ministers, and an chefs" "gradually began to be called Pushkin's contemporaries" (Akhmatova, 1990, p. 109).

In our opinion, it is advisable to consider only some of the possible strategies and variants of presentation, conceptualization and further research and refinement of the formulation of the topic with the working title "Pushkin as a Russian national hypertext", to propose a position of raising (in a general way) this not only interdisciplinary and cross-cultural, but nowadays a multimodal issue of Pushkin as a Russian national hypertext. (as, for example, in the classic books by V. Zhirmunsky "Pushkin and Byron" (1924) or "Pushkin and France" by B. Tomashevsky (1960) – creative biography (life and texts in their common genesis).

Translation as a component of Pushkin's hypertext

One of the important components of Pushkin's hypertext is artistic translation, a detailed history of the reception of Pushkin's text and its translations into other languages, as well as the important role of translations in the context of Russian and world culture: V. G. Belinsky emphasized that translations into Russian belong to Russian literature (Belinsky, 1953, p. 381). Let us also remember the determining role of translation in the formation of not only Russian, but also European

romanticism: "Monuments are taken and transplanted to a new soil and here they continue their independent life in new conditions and sometimes in new forms, just as a transplanted plant begins to live and grow in a new environment" (Likhachev, 1998, p. 20-21). Indeed, artistic translation itself is an open structure, dialogical in nature and aimed at mutual enrichment of cultures.

It should be emphasized, however, that poetry is the oldest literary form and, according to the idea of the universality of poetic language and the poetological concept of "all-translatability", there is no untranslatable poetic text. Form and content must be conveyed in a balanced way. For this purpose, the translator should not compete with the poet. The translator of "Eugene Onegin" must learn not to be A.S. Pushkin, not to try to have the same influence on the reader as A.S. Pushkin.

Vladimir Nabokov, who wrote extensive commentary on his translation of Pushkin's novel into English, objected to the rhyming translation of Onegin because such a translation distorts Pushkin's language and plot. He argued that the narrative and plot in Onegin are more important than rhyme and that the meaning of the work should be conveyed first (Nabokov, 1999).

Nabokov's notes and comments, especially in terms of comparing Pushkin's lines and images to Western European poetic discourse, are useful for translation. For example, he says that in the XXXIII stanza of the first chapter Pushkin used an image common in European poetry of that epoch – "the sea falling at the feet of the lover", and the poet took this image from the translations of his time. Knowing this, the translator can convey the emotional tone of the image more accurately.

Here it was important to show how changing ideas about translation can be reflected in literary works, to emphasize their focus on the relations between language, culture and identity, because neither the original language (Russian) nor the target language (foreign) exist in isolation in the modern world, but always in the context of other languages and cultures.

Back in 2008, in his article "English As A Language Always In Translation", Alistair Pennycook

wrote about claims of the English language to self-sufficiency, which nurtured various and numerous kinds of linguistic ethnocentrism, its refusal to allow a foreign intermediary, and perhaps numerous claims to the same cultural hegemony characteristic of Latin from late antiquity to the end of the Middle Ages and even beyond the chronological boundaries of the Renaissance, or French in the later classical era (Pennycook, 2008). In overcoming linguistic ethnocentrism, cultural and psychological boundaries, artistic translation has always played, and hopefully will continue to play, an important role in bringing ethnicities into the global flow and exchange of shared meanings.

Each culture, according to Antoine Berman, resists translation, its ethnocentric structure, its peculiar ethnonarcissism, is aimed at preserving its self-sufficiency, itself as the pure, it resists "forced mestization":

> [...] toute culture résiste à la traduction, même si elle a besoin essentiellement decelle-ci. La visée même de la traduction – ouvrir au niveau de l'écrit un certain rapport à l'Autre, féconder le Propre par la médiation de l'Étranger – heurte de front la structure ethnocentrique de toute culture, ou cette espèce de narcissisme qui fait que toute société voudrait être un Tout pur et non mélangé. Dans la traduction, il y a quelque chose de la violence du métissage [...][12] (Berman, 1984, p. 16).

The translator must remove the linguistic barrier between the reader and the poet and act as a kind of guide, a mediator between two cultures, between their own and the alien, in the words of A. Berman (1999, p. 75): "*Or, la traduction, de par sa visée de fidélité, appartient originairement à la dimension éthique. Elle est, dans son essence même, animée du désir d›ouvrir l'Étranger en tant qu›Étranger à son propre espace de langue*"[13], which creates unique opportunities both for artistic expression and for communication with other cultures.

Steps towards the study of Pushkin's work as a hypertext have already been made: the poet's

work is spoken of as a "hypermultimedia virtual art world" (Slyadneva, 2014), as the progenitor of the conceptosphere of Russian culture (Kondakov, 2020), Pushkin's poetry as a "mobile palimpsest" (Proskurin, 1999). Let us note the first steps towards the creation of a complete collection of the poet's works of the Internet era, undertaken by a team of authors at the IRLI RAS – "Puchkin Digital". The monograph by L.F. Kiseleva traces the "presence" of Pushkin in the prose of the twentieth century. Pushkin in the prose of the XX, – the author seeks to hear "steps", to see "traces", to feel "echoes" of Pushkin, to prolong the life of the poet in "...forms of moving moments" (Kiseleva, 1999, p. 9). And one of such wonderful projects is the animadoc of Andrei Bitov, Rezo Gabriadze and the director Asya Guseva (2021 – "Pushkin – Bitov – Gabriadze. Escape" –, which is a typical example of prolonging the life of the poet in the form of a multimodal hypertext that combines animation, comics (drawings by Gabriadze and drawings by A.S. Pushkin) documentary film interviews permeated with graphics.

But there is a well-founded fear that the Russian literary process (for all the conventional meaning of this definition) at the present stage of development, which is increasingly acquiring the features of metamodernism – a term that is fashionable, but not fully clarified and conceptualized even by those who classify themselves as metamodernists or act as theorists of the Russian version of metamodernism – will develop not together with Pushkin, but without him and instead of him, as I. Kondakov once argued in his book with the rather provocative title "Instead of Pushkin. Etudes on Russian Postmodernism". Here the flow of the author's thought is of high importance for us. Kondakov's assessment of contemporary Pushkin studies from the book "Instead of Pushkin..." (2011) to the book "After Pushkin: at the Origins of Russian Decadence

---

[12]   "[...] any culture resists translation, even if it essentially needs it. The very aim of translation – to open up a certain relationship to the Other at the level of the written word, to fertilize the Own through the mediation of the Stranger – clashes head-on with the ethnocentric structure of any culture, or this kind of narcissism that makes any society want to be a pure and unmixed Whole. In translation, there is something of the violence of miscegenation [...]".

[13]   "However, since translation aims at accuracy, it belongs to the ethical dimension. By its very nature, it is driven by the desire to reveal the Alien as the Alien to its own linguistic space" (our translation).

(Experience of Intertextual Analysis)" (2014) with the sad and in many respects fair statement that modern Pushkin studies have turned into the art of arbitrary interpretation of facts and texts concerning Pushkin or having nothing to do with him except for the interpreter's desire to carry out some "risky experience" over Pushkin (Kondakov, 2011, p. 260-304).

But still, the hope of finding a reader in future generations, expressed in M. Bakhtin's famous words about the incessant dialog, about the perception of the text across times and in W. Eco's concept of "an open work" remains. In a certain sense, Pushkin's hypertext has already been created and is being created, when the creative biography of the poet becomes a fact not only of historical and literary (Kiseleva, 1999), but also of national existence, is itself "slow reading" – rereading and rethinking of his works, from Y. Tynyanov's unfinished novel "Pushkin" (1935), commentary by Nabokov (1999) and by Lotman (1995) on "Eugene Onegin" to the anecdotes by Pseudo-Harms (N. Dobrokhotova-Maikova, V. Pyatnitsky), the fanfic "Onegin's Code" by Brain Down (2017) and a huge corpus of small genres of Internet folklore – amateur digital Pushkiniana.

Let us recall the words of A.Z. Lezhnev from his last lifetime book "Pushkin's Prose. The experience of style research", which sounded like a testament of the critic:

> Pushkin is revealed not into the past, but into the future. He cannot be studied only 'as an ordinary figure of literature' (B. Tomashevsky). The task of criticism is not only to place the writer into the epoch, but also to understand why he preserved life and effect beyond the limits of his time at the period when almost everything that surrounded him is covered by indifference and oblivion (Lezhnev, 1937, p. 381).

Let us turn once again to Pushkin's canon. The phrases of V. Odoevsky, "The sun of our poetry has gone down" and the words of Ap. Grigoriev "Pushkin is our everything" created a strict canon of perception of the poet's work, but already in 1922 in the article "Window looking on Nevsky" V. Khodasevich wrote:

Times are changing, and life, and the form of art with them. We cannot and should not turn Pushkin's canon into a Procrustean bed. The banner with Pushkin's name should stand vertically: let it not be something like an aesthetic barrier, hitting on the head of anyone who wants to go forward. Pushkin does not block the way, he opens it (1996, p. 489).

On this open path, the actualization of motifs embedded in Pushkin's texts and their embodiment in artistic works speaks of an ongoing open dialogue between the reader and Pushkin himself, of a return to texts of various genres (not only textbook poetry or prose, but also critical articles and letters), speaks of rereading them, establishing new internal links with the Russian and European general poetic context and searching for answers to questions concerning contemporary readers and Internet users.

Bibliography

AKHMATOVA, A. Word about Pushkin. *In*: AKHMATOVA, A. *Works in two volumes*. v. 2. Moscow: Pravda Publ., 1990.

BakhTin, M.M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics.* Moscow: Russian Dictionaries, Languages of Slavic culture, 2002.

BARTHES, R. *La Préparation du roman*: Cours au Collège de France (1978-1979 et 1979-1980). Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2015.

BELINSKY, V. G. Literary Explanation. *In*: BELINSKY, V. G. *Complete Collected Works*: 13 v. Moscow: USSR' Academy of Sciences Publ., 1953. v. 2.

BELY, A. Symbolism. Public lecture. *Vesy*, Moscow, n. 12, p. 36-42, Dec. 1908.

BERMAN, A. *La traduction et la lettre ou l'auberge du lointain*. Paris: Seuil, 1999.

BERMAN, A. *The Experience of the Foreign*: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany. Albany: Suny Press, 1984

Down, B. *Onegin's Code*. St. Petersburg: Palmira Publ., 2017. 622 p.

GENETTE, G. *Palimspestes*: la littérature au second degré. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1982.

GLORY of our Motherland (b. a.). *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, Moscow, n. 8, p. 2, Feb. 1937.

KHODASEVICH, V. F. Window on Nevsky. *In*: KHODASEVICH, V. F. *Collected works in 4 v.* Moscow: Soglasie Publ., 1996. v. 1.

KIRILLOV, V. To the Priests of Art. *In*: PROLETARIAN WRITERS. *Anthology of proletarian literature*. Moscow: State Publ., 1924.

KISELEVA, L. F. *Pushkin in the world of Russian prose of the XX century*. Moscow: Heritage Publ., 1999.

KONDAKOV, I. V. After Pushkin: at the Origins of Russian Decadence (Experience of Intertextual Analysis). *In:* THE WORK of M. Y. Lermontov in the context of modern culture. A collection of articles dedicated to the 200th anniversary of his birth. St. Petersburg: RHGA Publishing House, 2014. p. 52-84.

KONDAKOV, I. V. *Instead of Pushkin*: etudes about Russian postmodernism. Moscow: IBA Publ., 2011.

KONDAKOV, I. V. Pushkin: the birth of the conceptosphere of Russian culture. *Vestnik kulturologii*, Moscow, v. 1, n. 92, p. 9-36, Jan. 2020.

KRISTEVA, Y. *Text of the novel*. Selected prose: the destruction of poetics. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia Publ., 1998.

LEZHNEV, A. Z. *Pushkin's Prose*. Experience of style research. Moscow: Lit. Publ., 1937.

Likhachev, D. S. *Development of Russian literature of the X- XVII centuries*. St. Petersburg: Nauka Publishing House, 1998.

Lotman, Y. M. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin": Commentary: A teacher's manual. *In*: Lotman, Y. M. *Pushkin*: Biography of the writer; Articles and notes, 1960-1990; "Eugene Onegin": Commentary. St. Petersburg: Art, 1995. p. 472-762.

Lotman, Y. M. The structure of a literary text. *In:* Lotman, Y. M. *About art.* St. Petersburg: Art, 1998.

MANDELSTAM, O. *On Poetry*. Leningrad: Academia Publ., 1928.

Nabokov, V. V. *14 Comments on "Eugene Onegin" by Alexander*

Pushkin. oscow: NPC Intelvak Publ., 1999.

Pennycook, A. English As A Language Always In Translation, *European Journal of English Studies*, Milton Parc, v. 12, n. 1, p. 33-47, Jun. 2008.

PROSKURIN, O. A. *Pushkin's Poetry, or Movable Palimpsest*. Moscow: New Literary Review Publ., 1999.

"PUCHKIN DIGITAL" – project of a digital academic edition of A. S. Pushkin's works. Available at: http://www.pushkin-digital.ru. Accessed: 9 Jun. 2024.

SLYADNEVA, N. A. Pushkin's novel "Eugene Onegin. Artistic world of the poet and modern information environment: getting ahead of the epoch. *Culture: Theory and Practice*, Moscow, Sept. 1st, 2014. Available at: http://theoryofculture.ru/issues/2014_01/510/. Accessed: 7 Sept. 2023.

Tomashevsky, B. V. *Pushkin and France.* Leningrad: Soviet Writer Publ., 1960.

TSVETAEVA, M. Letter to V. F. Khodasevich. May 1934. *In*: TSVETAEVA M. Collected Works. 7 v. T. 7. Moscow: Ellis Luck Publ., 1995.

VYAZEMSKY, P. A. *Aesthetics and literary criticism*. Moscow: Art Publ., 1984.

YAMPOLSKY, M. *Memory of Tiresias*. Moscow: RIK Kultura, 1993.

Zhirmunsky, V. M. *Byron and Pushkin*: from the history of romanticism poems. Leningrad: Academia Publ., 1924.

Alexey Yuryevich Ovcharenko

Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Professor of the Russian Language and Linguocultural Studies Department, the Institute of the Russian Language, Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.

Mailing Adress:

ALEXEY YURYEVICH OVCHARENKO

10 Miklukho-Maklaya St., b. 3, Miklukho-Maklaya St.

Moscow, 117198, Russia